IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION No. 304 OF 2002

PETITIONER — Sushil Kumar Nayak, aged about 39 years, S/o R.L.Nayak, working as Cashier Cum Clerk in Raigarh Regional Rural Bank, Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

Versus

RESPONDENT — The Raigarh Regional Rural Bank, Raigarh through its Chairman, Station Road, Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..W.P.No.304/..... **सन् 2002**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	23.09.2005 Mr. Sameer Behar, learned counsel for the petitioner. The petitioner was appointed as Cashier-cum-Clerk in the Regional Rural Bank, Raigarh in the year 1982. The petitioner was issued show cause notice on 02.06.1992 (Annexure P-3) containing five charges of violating the instructions of the joint custody system, interfered with the handing over of the charge of branch, Khamhar, remaining unauthorisedly absent from 10.08.1991 to 17.08.1991, submitted false document. Subsequently charge sheet was issued on 01.09.1992 (Annexure P-5) whereby it was directed to deposit the excess amount with the State Bank of India. One more charge sheet has been issued on 12.10.1992 (Annexure P-6) for misconduct of carrying excess cash amount beyond the permissible limit. The enquiry was conducted and the petitioner participated in the enquiry. The Enquiry Officer, after holding proper enquiry, submitted report on 02.06.1995. All charges alleged against the petitioner were found proved. The disciplinary authority / chairman by order dated 25.03.1996/ 08.04.1996 passed an order to withhold one year increment with cumulative effect. The petitioner preferred an appeal before the Board of Directors of Regional Rural Bank, Raigarh. The appeal was also dismissed. After having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the records, I am of the view that the Management has full authority to consider the case of misconduct and impose appropriate punishment, particularly when the enquiry was properly	

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ...W.P.No. 304/... **सन् 2002**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	held and the charges alleged against the petitioner had been found proved. The order passed by the disciplinary authority has been confirmed by the appellate authority. The punishment is a minor punishment withholding one increment with cumulative effect. In view of the foregoing, I am of the view that the order passed by the disciplinary authority be not interfered with. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed. Consequently, all pending applications also stand disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	

9.11.05
25.11.05